

APPROVED
Centerville Township Planning Commission
Special Meeting
Leland Public Schools – Performing Arts Center
September 21, 2022

Call to Order: Tim Johnson, Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:30 PM.

Attendance: Present: Tim Johnson, Jamie Damm, Joe Mosher, Lindy Kellogg. Absent: Dan Hubbell. Staff Present: Recording Secretary Dana Boomer, Zoning Administrator Tim Cypher

Johnson introduced the Planning Commission and staff, gave a brief summary of the duties and responsibilities of the Planning Commission, and gave a brief summary of the process for reviewing a site plan. Johnson also gave an update on the question from last meeting regarding what is considered “acting” by the terms of the Zoning Ordinance. Per attorney review, acting means either approving, approving with conditions, or denying an application. In addition, the township could extend the 90-day review timeframe with written consent of the applicant.

Public Comment: Chris Grobbel, Grobbel Environmental Lake Leelanau – Johnson asked for only comments on the agenda at this public comment session. However, there are no other opportunities for public comment before a decision is potentially made. He requests that a public comment session be added prior to the PC decision.

Mike Schlaefflin – Lake Leelanau Drive – He is a township manager in central Michigan. Regarding the process of review, he has seen the notice for the public hearing in August. He is unsure as to whether the public hearing was regarding the preliminary site plan review or the special use permit. He requested that the PC follow the Zoning Ordinance, which can be difficult, and sometimes takes judgement on the part of the Planning Commissioners.

Agenda: The PC reviewed the agenda. There was a brief discussion regarding adding a public comment – there will be a public comment added before PC deliberations. **Motion to approve agenda as amended by Damm, second by Kellogg. All in favor, motion carried.**

Conflict of Interest: None

Revise/Approve Minutes:

The PC reviewed the draft minutes of the August 29, 2022 special meeting. A change was made to page 2 – boat fuel is not currently sold, but is a proposed use. **Motion to approve the August 29, 2022 special meeting minutes as amended by Damm, second by Kellogg. All in favor, motion carried.**

Zoning/Planning Issues:

Leelanau Pines Campground Site Plan Review – Johnson summarized the process for a site plan review and the possible outcomes. Any decision must be supported by documentation and findings of fact.

Applicant Response to List of PC Questions: Jason Vander Kodde, engineer with Fishbeck Engineering, presented for the applicant; Katy Hallgren and Shannon Sullivan were also present from Northgate. The application has been changed since the last meeting to remove the request for a future phase of additional campsites. Roads have been widened to comply with fire requirements. The geometry of the entrance has been amended based on recommendations of the Road Commission. The boat slips are now shown as the configuration that is being proposed for the re-build, and the boat wash station is shown.

Vander Kodde then addressed the PC question list that was sent to Northgate last week. (The questions and responses from Northgate are posted on the township website under the September 2022 meeting.) Vander Kodde summarized and read responses to several of the questions, including those relating to the use of Lake Leelanau, potential additional studies (including the lake carrying capacity), traffic concerns (including the traffic study required by the Road Commission), and the compliance of the application with the Master Plan.

Damm asked how many trees or acres of trees will be removed in the proposed plan. Vander Kodde replied that there has not been a full tree survey done, and so they do not know how many trees will be removed. Vander Kodde pointed the PC members to the provided landscape plan, which shows areas where trees will be preserved, and areas where trees will be planted. This number has not been quantified. Hallgren stated that the intention is to preserve as many trees as possible, and to have trees remain on individual campsites. Kellogg asked about trees along the shoreline, where the store and other features are proposed. How will the shoreline be preserved between the boat slips and Rice Creek? Vander Kodde stated that they will be preserving a large portion of the ½ mile of shoreline owned by Leelanau Pines. They will be attempting to save as many trees as possible in the features area near boat slips. Damm asked how much of the 1/2 mile of shoreline is regulated wetland and can't be touched anyways. Vander Kodde stated that approximately 90% of their shoreline is wetland. However, the State of Michigan allows tree removal in wetlands; the only requirements it that soil not be disturbed. This is true for all property owners. Hallgren stated that the intent is to place the pools in areas that are already open, so that trees do not need to be removed. If trees do need to be removed, they are intending to replant them in other areas. Vander Kodde stated that the replanting of trees will protect the views from the lake side.

Mosher asked for clarification regarding the baseline number of sites – several documents show different numbers. Hallgren stated that there are less “existing sites” on the site plans than there are actually sites currently at the campground. Some of the existing sites will be removed for the camp store. Vander Kodde stated that there will be existing sites picked up from what is now staff camping and behind the administrative building, but sites will be lost not only to the camp store but to the parking lot expansion. The traffic study was based on 355 proposed sites, because it was completed based on a slightly different map – the actual number of proposed sites is 18 less (337 sites). Mosher asked whether all of the new sites will be designated for short term. Vander Kodde stated that they were designated as such for the traffic study, to be conservative

for the study. For the actual park use, it will be market driven, and so these sites may end up as either seasonal or short-term. Damm pointed out a typographical error in the traffic study – Schomberg and Lakeshore is a t-intersection, not a cross-road, so has one stop sign, not two.

Cypher read a section of the Zoning Ordinance pertaining to applicants receiving applicable state and federal approvals. In his reading, the PC can hold approval of the site plan until those approvals are received, or they can make a condition of the approval be the receipt of those other approvals. Vander Kodde stated that it is common for Planning Commissions to grant approval with conditions that include the receipt of those other approvals, versus holding approval until those permits are received. Cypher then spoke regarding setbacks at the waters edge, and the response given by Northgate in their responses to the PC questions. Northgate clarified that there is only a patio on the shore side of the camp store, not a deck. Decks are considered structures, and must comply with setbacks, patios are not considered structures. Cypher then spoke regarding the discussion on keyholing and the response from Northgate, and asked the PC to consider whether a legal opinion should be sought on this topic. Cypher has not had a chance to review the traffic study, and will be awaiting the response from the Road Commission. He stated that the township may also hire their own traffic engineering expert to cover this topic. Cypher summarized Northgate's response to questions regarding buffers between Leelanau Pines and neighboring properties, and asked them to clarify whether the buffers they are proposing will provide buffering from noise, odors, smoke, and other nuisances. Vander Kodde referred the PC to the landscaping plan. Cypher asked if Northgate feels comfortable that the trees that are proposed to be retained will be enough to mitigate nuisances? Vander Kodde said yes.

Cypher asked where Northgate was on their submission for an expanded campground with EGLE. Vander Kodde stated that EGLE requires zoning approval before they will accept a campground application, so this application has not yet been submitted. Cypher stated that in the applicant's responses they mentioned amenities – Cypher gave the Webster's Dictionary definition of amenities and asked if the applicant accepted this? The applicant stated yes.

Mosher asked for additional clarification regarding whether non-camp residents would be allowed to launch and moor boats from the campground? The applicant stated that only guests (short-term or seasonal) would be allowed to launch and moor boats at the campground – not members of the public who are not staying at the campground. Damm asked how that would be monitored. The applicant stated that guests will have to check in at the front entrance building.

Mosher then asked about how quiet hours and other regulations will be enforced? Will there be 24 hour staffing? Public comment has been submitted stating that there are currently concerns with non-compliance with speed limits, no 24-hour staff, and other issues. If these are not being enforced now, how can the PC be sure that things like the boat launching and wash stations will be enforced? Vander Kodde stated that the majority of the boats at the site will be moored by seasonal campers, and so the day traffic is not expected to merit a staffed wash station.

Sullivan stated that with the additional campsites, there will be 24-hour staff. There were 18 staff members this year, which was more than previous owners had. With additional campsites, there will be additional staff, and 24-hour staff, as well as staff living at the campground. The applicant stated that the speed limit is 5 mph in the campground.

Kellogg asked the applicant to comment on the amenity of mooring boats in the shallows, not in the 82 slips, which would be offered to guests. Vander Kodde stated that seasonal mooring is regulated by the State of Michigan. Mooring posts will not be added, as those are regulated. Short-term mooring is legally entitled and guests will not be stopped from mooring short-term in the shallows. Johnson asked for clarification on the expected day-traffic of boats being launched from the campground. He asked if boats brought by campers would be logged and monitored for when they would exceed the ability to park trailers or launch boats. The applicant replied that part of the reservation process is whether the camper would be bringing a boat. Johnson asked if there is an extra charge to bring a boat. The applicant was not sure. Johnson asked if there was data available regarding the number of boats launched in the past. The applicant replied no, as this was their first full summer of operation.

Kellogg asked for clarification regarding impervious surfaces. She asked where runoff from the additional asphalt surfaces will be, and if there will be an impact to Rice Creek, the shoreline, and other areas of the property. Vander Kodde replied that the Road Commission is requiring a culvert under the driveway to allow the standing water in the ditch to flow, and the applicant is complying with this. The applicant pointed to the site plans, which show three basins for storm water runoff. Most water will infiltrate the ground in the campsites, with the rest being routed to the basins. Those basins are sized for 25-year rain events. Their size calculations have been submitted to the County Drain Commission and the applicant is awaiting the Commission's response.

Johnson asked for clarification regarding lot coverage. The applicant's response only calculated lot coverage of buildings. Johnson asked Cypher whether lot coverage only counts buildings or whether other portions of the use are calculated. Cypher replied that the Zoning Ordinance does not define lot coverage, and only defines building lot coverage. Cypher would recommend discussing the definition of lot coverage with legal counsel. Johnson would like to have further discussion on that, given that a large portion of the lot is covered by RVs, porches from RVs, and other aspects that are not buildings, but are also covering the lot. The applicant stated that the stormwater runoff from the RVs and associated accessories infiltrates into the individual campsites. In addition, those can be moved, while buildings and their accessories cannot be moved. Johnson stated that in his opinion, the Zoning Ordinance is asking for total lot coverage, not just building coverage.

Johnson takes issue with the applicant's definition of expansion with regard to the Master Plan statement that no expansion is projected for the campground uses in the Master Plan. He would like to get attorney clarification regarding this, as in his opinion this means that the campground use should not be expanded, not that other uses cannot be added as the applicants have claimed. Vander Kodde would like the legal teams from the township and Northgate to work together to come to a consensus on the meaning of this language.

Mosher asked for clarification regarding the response from Northgate regarding the concerns from neighbors regarding the number of people coming into the campground. He believes Northgate did not fully address the concern regarding sheer numbers of short-term campers coming into the campground. Mosher stated that with some quick math, assuming two people in

seasonal campsites and four people in short-term campsites, and 75% occupancy, comes out to almost 1000 people at the campground, which almost equals the number of registered voters in the township. He asked the applicant to expand on this and the impact to the community and the community amenities with this number of people coming into the community. The applicant stated that they acknowledge that there will be growth and new people. They take exception to the idea of a “theme park” with people coming and going without staying at the park and with the idea of lights, music, roller coasters, and activity right up to the property boundaries. Sullivan stated that the majority of the campground amenities are tucked into the center of the campground, which both makes them easily accessible by guests and buffers them from surrounding properties. In addition, there are enforced quiet hours. The amenities will be built over time, not all at once. The amenities are for the daytime use of the guests. Kellogg asked for clarification on the amenities along the waterfront (pavilions, pools, parking lot, etc.) and the fact that these are not buffered. Sullivan stated that these amenities would not be accessible at night and there would be no lights. The intent would be for campers to stay on-site, and offer amenities to keep this, which decreases in-and-out traffic. In addition, some trees along the waterfront will be left. Kellogg asked how this fits with their answer in the Q&A that states the campground will benefit the local economy. Sullivan replied that they will be creating jobs, both part-time and full-time, for the local community. Kellogg asked about the food and beverage offerings. Sullivan stated there would be ice cream and other concession type offerings that could be consumed on site.

Damm asked about the reconfiguration of the 82 boat slips, and how this complies with ZO sections on non-conforming uses. Vander Kodde stated that they have an EGLE permit for 82 slips. Cypher clarified that the township never reviewed the original permit application for 82 slips. However, legal counsel has stated that the 82 slips are allowed. There is some dispute as to whether the slips could be reconfigured under this counsel recommendation. Johnson clarified that the attorney stated that a marina expansion would have to go to the Zoning Board of Appeals, because it is a non-conforming use. The campground also does not have an existing permit as currently configured, but can come before the Planning Commission because the campground is not a non-conforming use.

Kellogg asked about the site plan drawings. Regarding the retention ponds, one appears to be in close proximity to Rice Creek. How close is the proximity and why was this location chosen? Is there concern that the pond could be exceeded and overflow into the creek? Vander Kodde stated that the basin is approximately 75’ away from the creek, and includes a small notch in the berm to direct any overflow down the creek without erosive velocity. In addition, during construction there will be silt fence between the construction and the creek.

Draft Findings of Fact: Cypher had presented a draft findings of fact for PC consideration. The first four pages of this draft document include pertinent Master Plan sections. Pages 6-15 are the currently-incomplete findings of fact. The PC began a discussion of these pages. Page 6-8 covers basic site plan requirements – there are still a couple of items to be received from the applicant.

The PC moved to a discussion of the Standards for Granting Site Plan Approval:

1. *All elements of the site plan shall be harmoniously and efficiently organized in relation to topography, the size and type of the lot, the character of adjoining property and the type and size of buildings. The site shall be so developed as not to impede the normal and orderly development or improvement of surrounding property for uses permitted in this Ordinance.*

Damm – The plan meets the first sentence of this section. She has reservations about whether the plan meets the second sentence of this section. She is concerned about the traffic issues, and not everyone has had a chance to review the traffic study in detail.

Kellogg – She doesn't feel like all elements are present. She would like to see some topographical drawings that represent the view of someone at eye level from the lakeshore and the road, along with a comparison with what is currently present.

Mosher – He struggles with this. The nature of the existing use isn't really compatible with the surrounding residential properties. It's hard to say whether the plan is harmoniously organized with regard to surrounding properties. He agrees with Kellogg's comment regarding topography and the need to be able to conceptualize what the property would look like from surrounding properties/areas.

Johnson – The site is fairly flat, so he doesn't see much issue with topography. His concerns are related to overall lot coverage, and whether there will end up being over 25% lot coverage.

2. *The landscape shall be preserved in its natural state, insofar as practical, by minimizing tree and soil removal, and by topographic modifications which result in maximum harmony with adjacent areas.*

Johnson – He has concerns regarding the amount of tree removal and whether the proposal meets this standard. The site plan is proposing to remove a lot of trees.

Mosher – The applicant stated that they will be retaining as many trees as practical, while expanding the number of campsites. If the PC presumes that the new sites are needed, then it seems that the tree removal is being minimized.

Kellogg – Having all of the structures along the waterfront does not seem to be in harmony with adjacent areas. It's hard to know without waterfront-view drawings what the impact will be on the waterfront.

Damm – She wants more information on what trees will be removed along the waterfront. She wants to make sure it's not just going to be a bunch of stumps along the lakeshore.

Cypher asked the applicant whether there will be campsites inside the wetland area.

Vander Kodde said there would not be.

3. *Site plans shall fully conform with the published surface water drainage standards of the County Drain Commission.* – This is addressed by the County Drain Commission, and there will be a condition regarding approval by the County Drain Commission.
4. *Special attention shall be given to proper site drainage so that removal of storm waters will not adversely affect neighboring property owners.* – This is addressed by Soil &

Erosion Control, and there will be a condition regarding approval by Soil & Erosion Control.

5. *The site plan shall provide reasonable, visual and sound privacy for all dwelling units located therein and adjacent parcels. Fences, walks, barriers and landscaping shall be used, as appropriate, for the protection and enhancement of property and for the privacy of its occupants.*

Damm – She believes that there are some nice barriers with the trees that will be kept, and most of the new amenities are in the center of the campground. She is concerned about the amenities that are right on the lakeshore.

Kellogg – She asked Cypher whether the campsites would be considered dwelling units. Cypher read the pertinent sections, and the PC had consensus that RVs would be considered dwelling units.

Johnson – He asked if there had been complaints regarding noise regarding the existing campground. Cypher stated he had received no noise complaints since beginning with the township in 2009. Johnson is concerned about sound privacy for adjacent properties. There have been comments from existing campers that quiet hours have not been enforced historically.

Mosher – Given the nature of this use, he doesn't see anything wrong with the privacy accorded individual campsites.

Cypher asked whether a condition should be placed regarding buffering if a wind event or other event results in the loss of a substantial number of trees? He would like the PC to consider this. Johnson does not think that can be adequately addressed at this time; Damm agrees.

Kellogg has concerns with other activities, such as music, encroaching on the sound privacy of adjacent properties.

The PC took a time check (8:35 pm) and had consensus to have public comment at this time and then decide whether to continue the discussion of the findings of fact or postpone that until the next meeting.

Chris Grobbel – Grobbel Environmental Planning Associates – There have been several changes to the application since the Public Hearing. There is always a question regarding what is the authority of the township and what is the authority of the other agencies. The township can ask for environmental studies, whether it is specifically stated in the ordinance or not. The PC has not seen the studies for many of the items in the plan. Trails in wetlands cannot be wood chips, they have to be elevated boardwalks. No detailed stormwater plans have been shown to the PC. There will be up to five state permits, and the PC should either have those permits, or have the information those permits will be based on. Food service will cause changes to the septic permitting. Regarding the traffic study, the PC shouldn't be distracted by level of service, they should focus on the actual increase in traffic. The PC can require a greater amount of stormwater runoff than is required by the county. There are ample reasons to deny.

Don Baty – He has written two letters regarding the topic. The PC is missing part of the analysis, which is whether the site plan is acceptable, and whether the plan qualifies for a special use. When a special use is examined, the main question is, “is this in the best interest of the community as a whole”. The findings of fact go to the technical points of the site plan, but the PC needs to go beyond the technical points. The PC needs to make findings of fact as to whether this project is in the best interest of the community as a whole. The applicants are now on their best behavior. This is a discretionary decision, and if the PC thinks that information is relevant, they need to demand the information. Once an approval is given, it is very hard to revoke. With regards to the Master Plan, look at Section 8.3.2, the uses in a commercial resort district should be reviewed to ensure they are compatible with the goals of the Master Plan. The PC needs to consider all of the goals of the Master Plan, not just Section 8.4

Kama Ross – Retired District Forester – She has worked with Soil/Erosion and the Drain Commissioner. She wants to reiterate that the PC does not have all of the information they need, and it is obtainable. There are professionals who can tell you exactly how many trees will be removed from this site, and the impact the removal of those trees will have on the quality of the environment, and the ability of the environment to handle pollution and sedimentation. She wants the PC to ask for more information on how this proposal will impact the environment.

Susan Wheadon – Centerville Township – It saddens her that during a worldwide water crisis and climate emergency, that developers would threaten the water, land, wildlife, and way of life. The environment does not have a voice, and it needs the people to protect it. The community cannot take for granted the gifts that were given to it. The PC must say no.

John Popa – Bingham Township – He lives on Lake Leelanau. A marina is not permitted, and one of the drawings still shows a marina and deck in the setback. One of the drawings mentions a pool enclosure – is this a structure? There should be nothing in the setback, even decks and pool enclosures. Whether there is a lake carrying capacity study or not, they are concerned with the additional traffic on the lake. This is like adding several hundred additional homeowners to the lake. The LLLA is spending hundreds of thousands of dollars to combat invasive species such as Eurasian Milfoil, and all of the new campers will bring additional invasive species. Many resorters bring bicycles. CR-643 cannot support large volumes of extra bicycles. This proposal has no benefit to the community. The Conservancy should buy this property.

Chris Bunbury – He is an environmental strategist, and taking a look at why most people come to the area, it’s the natural resources. One of the things known about campgrounds is that they generate contaminants, including stormwater runoff, septage, PFAS, medical waste, and other issues. Expanding the campground means expanding contaminants. The PC should make sure these contaminants are being managed properly currently before allowing an expansion.

John Stoller – Glazier Beach – There are five other people from Glazier Beach here tonight. They are close to Leelanau Pines, and they oppose the expansion. Focusing on the Master Plan, the natural resources and rural character need to be protected. The major expansion of transient uses will result in people who do not have the respect for the lake and other resources that is held by the existing seasonal campers. He doesn’t think the boat wash station will be enforced. The traffic on the road is already dangerous, and this will just make it worse. The boat traffic will

also get worse. It's a large lake, but the sandbar will end up being like Torch Lake if this is allowed. This is not the peaceful, rural nature of the area. The PC needs to focus on the Master Plan and what they want to preserve.

Mike Schlaefflin – There is a theme through these comments, and it is clear to him that the PC needs some additional resources to vet this application. The developer hires professional consulting staff to shepherd this plan through. There is so much information that the PC does not have that they are entitled to. The PC needs to slow this process down, as it would be in the township's best interest. The Zoning Administrator seems to be deferring to the developer. He reiterated his request to slow the process down.

Lori Okerson – S. Shugart Shores – Northgate continues to stress that they are not asking at this time to increase the number of boat slips. On Northgate's Facebook page, someone recently asked about the boat slips, and Leelanau Pines' response was that they allow people to anchor in the shallows. This would hugely increase the number of boats there.

Nancy Popa – Bingham Township – The shoreline is a precious habitat, for amphibians, birds, and other species. There should be no development on the shoreline. Regarding the capacity study for the lake. The US Army Corps of Engineers routinely uses this methodology, and it is a useful tool. In 2001, a lake carrying capacity study was conducted by the LLLA, and at that time the number of boats exceeded the number that should be on the lake. This proposal abuses the riparian rights of the Leelanau Pines property, and a carrying study should be required.

Don Koppens – Centerville Township – He is about 800' south of Leelanau Pines. About 25 years ago, a storm went through that area, and a lot of trees were lost in Leelanau Pines. As soon as that happened, the noise level from the park went up drastically. There is not a lot of problem with noise now, but when he goes fishing at 630 in the morning, there is no noise, but when he is out there at 9 pm, there is partying evident, both on shore and on the boats. Adding pools close to the lake will just create more noise. When he went fishing Labor Day, there were 78 boats in slips and another 16 moored next to the docks. People in the park have campers with decks on them that are not required to be permitted. From the perspective of the homeowners on the lake, why does the camp have a better arrangement than individual homeowners, who are only allowed to keep a camper in one place for 60 days. If only the campers are allowed to launch boats, does this mean that if someone camps for one day, are they allowed to moor a boat for a full season?

Theresa Broom – S. Manor Drive – She wants to consider how this benefits the community. She started out in Lake Leelanau RV park, and they loved the area so much and respect it so much they bought a house here, and their children now love it. They loved the RV park. She would hope that this project would contribute to the community, but there have to be checks and balances. The septic needs to be considered, and whether any of this is reaching the water. The water quality must be protected. The noise is also a concern. The Lake Leelanau RV park is run fabulously, with enforced quiet hours.

Kim Wall – Centerville Township – There is an inequality between the applicants and the PC. The applicants are professionals, and can pull in all the needed resources. She wants to make

sure the PC draws in the resources that are needed, and doesn't have to use volunteer resources to process this plan. Rather than conceding unnecessarily to undue time constraints, the PC should make sure they have everything they need.

Gary Ford – Bingham Township – He is a real estate attorney, and has been for 40 years. The PC has to ask themselves whether this complies with the Master Plan. There has been a discussion surrounding the Master Plan. “These uses” refers to the present uses in the district, and so the Master Plan is stating that there was no expectation of the expansion of campgrounds in this district. The PC must consider the forethought that went into the Master Plan, and the anticipation of the current problem.

Dan Strichoff – Leland Township – He agrees with the previous speaker regarding the meaning of “these uses”. For over 20 years, he has been going by the RV park on boats and in cars. This campground does not fit with the rural character of the township, even in its current state. And doubling or tripling the size does not fit with the Master Plan. The community clearly does not want this project. The PC can and should stop this process tonight, based on the community input and the Master Plan.

Ann Bell – She is a seasonal camper at Leelanau Pines. She used to travel with a popup camper, and has been to the Yogi Bear parks, and wants the PC to think about the level of noise and activity seen at these parks. She wants the PC to consider whether there will be a PA system at the campground.

Charles Kaufman – Elmwood Township – (Mr. Kaufman handed written comments to the PC and then read the comments) He opposes this proposal. The plan is excessive, and will expand the invasive species problems on the lake. Traffic, noise, and light pollution will be increased with this proposal. He does not believe this plan can meet the Master Plan. Centerville needs to make sure this proposal complies with the Zoning Ordinance, and doesn't decrease the quality of the lake. He requests that the PC not allow this to be a place where people can bring boats to the lake. He has had problems with Soil Erosion and the Road Commission enforcing stormwater control issues from a nearby event venue. Trees cannot be depended upon to control noise. He hopes that the Road Commission enforces their requirements.

Ken Gibson – He lives on Lake Leelanau. The decision of the PC is purely discretionary, and the question to be answered is at what point the lake's carrying capacity for both boats and other resources begins to deteriorate. This point has probably already been reached, and the safety threshold has been reached. The implication is that additional boats should not be added to the lake, and that is what Northgate wants to do. The PC needs to say no.

Michael Hardings – He is about a mile south of Leelanau Pines. He is a big picture guy. Leelanau County is a precious national gem. The Sleeping Bear Dunes has been voted one of the most beautiful places in America. Michigan advertises itself as “water-winter wonderland” and “pure Michigan”. That's what Leelanau is – the purest in environment, in conservancies, in water, in opportunities for families, in almost every way. He doesn't want to impugn Northgate – they do their homework and have a good presentation. But they miss the big picture. They don't see what Leelanau County is. The PC is not here to do a permit for a house. They are here to do a

permit for revising an entire area of the county. The PC are the protectors of this environmental gem. The township does not need an amusement park. The PC should be deliberate, take their time, do their homework, and keep the big picture in mind.

Janelle Schultz – She is a seasonal camper in Leelanau Pines, and her site will be eliminated. They received an email that their site was going to be eliminated, with no guarantee that another space would be available for them for next season. They have a camper with a deck, a patio, and other amenities. They love this area, but have had to sell after over 36 years in this area. They lost money by selling at the end of the year, but that doesn't seem to matter to Northgate. The only thing that matters to Northgate is the bottom line. They will take the natural environment and they will make their money and then they will leave, and the community's children will not have the opportunity to enjoy these resources. She encouraged the PC to research what the Northgate has done to other campsites. She showed the PC how many people from Leelanau Pines were in the audience, most of whom have camped more than 20 years at the Pines. She asked the PC not to let Northgate into the community.

Wayne Selanski – He is a camper at Leelanau Pines, and a property owner in Centerville Township. As a property owner, $\frac{3}{4}$ of an acre is required on the lakeshore to build a house. This density is substantially exceeded by the proposed campground. He agrees with all the other speakers.

PC Deliberations:

At this time (9:25 pm) it was determined that the building needed to be vacated.

Kellogg moved to table the discussion of the findings of fact until the October regular meeting; seconded by Damm. All in favor, motion carried.

Johnson stated that he does not feel he will be ready to approve or deny this permit by October 3. Damm and Kellogg agreed. Mosher would like to discuss an extension of the 90 day period with the applicant. The other PC members agreed, and Damm does not feel like she will have the needed information by the October 3 meeting. The PC discussed this.

Kellogg moved to request an extension of 60 days to the review period, Damm seconded. Johnson stated he would prefer 90 days. Mosher stated he would like to see this move faster than 90 days, but it is unknown how long it will take to get the needed information. **Kellogg retracted her motion. Damm moved to request an extension of 90 days to the review period, Mosher seconded. All in favor, motion carried.**

Johnson then asked the applicant whether they would agree to the 90 days extension. The applicant stated that they are not prepared to address that tonight. Johnson stated that the PC will continue their discussion of the findings of fact on October 3. Kellogg asked if the applicant would be able to address the issue before October 3. Vander Kodde stated they would need until October 3, as they don't know yet exactly what information they will be requiring. Mosher stated that there is a lot of information to go through, and the PC might still not have a specific inventory of what they need even on October 3.

Public Comment – None

Next Meeting Date: The next regular meeting is scheduled for October 3, 2022.

Adjournment: Johnson moved to adjourn the meeting at 9:31 PM, Kellogg seconded. All in favor, motion carried.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dana Boomer
Recording Secretary